PRISONS AND PAROLE

by

Helen B. Shaffer

Oct. 9
1957

PRISONS AND PAROLE

EFFORTS by Nathan Leopold to win release from Stateville Penitentiary in Illinois have caused many persons to wonder how the 52-year-old convict can expect to overcome the admonition of the sentencing judge that he must never be let out of prison. The fact is that in the 33 years since Leopold and Loeb confessed to the kidnap-murder of a 12-year-old boy, parole has become so firmly entrenched as an alternative to long-term incarceration that even lifers can now hope to win some years of freedom before they die. Fewer than 33,000 of the 83,000 prisoners released from federal and state institutions last year had served their full sentences; 57 per cent of the total number leaving prison were let out early on conditional terms, chiefly parole.[1]

Leopold's petition for a rehearing of his plea for parole is scheduled to come before the Illinois parole board on Nov. 14. Earlier petitions were turned down in 1953 and in 1955. Leopold became eligible for parole after Gov. Adlai E. Stevenson in 1949 reduced his sentence from 99 to 85 years in recognition of services as a human guinea pig in wartime malaria control research. When Leopold's first two petitions for parole failed, he sought to have his sentence commuted to 64 years, which would have made him eligible for release on good behavior in December 1957. That plea was rejected, July 30, by Gov. William J. Stratton on advice of the state parole board.

Opposing Views on Treatment of Life-Termers

The Leopold case reflects two contrary points of view on administration of criminal justice in the United States. On one hand is the traditional view that the penalty to be paid by an offender should correspond to the seriousness of the crime; on the other is the newer view that imprisonment has a rehabilitative function and should give way as soon as possible to a period of supervised freedom in the community.

[1] Federal Bureau of Prisons, *National Prisoner Statistics*, August 1957.

It is argued in favor of paroling Leopold that he is a changed man, fully repentant; that he shows no trace of criminality today; and that he could serve society better outside the penitentiary. A similar plea for release of other life-termers was made recently by the warden of a Minnesota prison; he contended that it was inhuman and wasteful of public money to keep fully regenerated men in prison for decades, with no hope of release, because of a crime committed early in life. The warden asserted that 90 per cent of life-termers, most of them sentenced for murder or rape, would be harmless to society if released.[2] Another warden, on the Pacific Coast, has said:

> Little is accomplished by long prison sentences except to satisfy public revenge. We should release the prisoner at that important psychological point in his incarceration when he has demonstrated he has made his adjustment and is really ready for release under supervision.[3]

The punitive element, however, is strong in American justice—even where convicts are treated by modern methods. The chairman of the U.S. Board of Parole has noted that "Punishment is still an ingredient in the sentences imposed by our judges and in the parole statutes." Parole boards rarely release a man for no other reason than that he will be "a good risk on the street"; the nature of the crime committed also carries considerable weight. "Actually many inmates have had all the punishment, or treatment, if you prefer, that they need to become good and useful citizens, when the gates of prison close behind them. If we lay punishment and treatment end to end, it is hard to say where the former ends and the latter begins." [4]

Popular Criticism of Liberal Parole Practices

Public attention has been drawn to the parole question today chiefly because the current magnitude of the crime problem has compelled wide scrutiny of all the agencies and methods of crime control. The Federal Bureau of Investigation reported on Sept. 23 that more major crimes were committed in the first six months of 1957 than in any comparable period on record; the estimated half-year total of 1,339,670 crimes averaged out at one every 11 seconds, an 8 per cent increase over the first six months of 1956.

---

[2] Douglas C. Rigg, "The Penalty Worse Than Death," *Saturday Evening Post*, Aug. 31, 1957, p. 18.

[3] Kenyon Scudder, "Prisons Will Not Solve Our Crime Problem," *Federal Probation*, March 1954, p. 38.

[4] Scovel Richardson, "Parole and the Law," *NPPA* (National Probation and Parole Association) *Journal*, January 1956, p. 27.

Many persons attribute the high crime rate to lenient treatment of offenders. They say that an excess of concern for prisoners and insufficient regard for public safety have led to too liberal granting of parole. Widely publicized statements by F.B.I. Director J. Edgar Hoover, advocating tougher handling of hoodlum criminal elements, have tended to reinforce popular suspicion of all penological practices which appear to go easy on the offender.

Hoover has found it necessary on occasion to reassure correctional personnel that he is not opposed to the institution of parole itself; he is critical only of indiscriminate granting of parole and inefficient supervision of parolees. Hoover told a national parole conference at Washington on Apr. 9, 1956, that he had found "growing concern among law enforcement officials over the increase in crimes by repeaters and those who have been improperly selected as beneficiaries of parole, probation and other forms of clemency." [5] He cautioned the group not to forget that "The time-proven deterrents to crime are certainty of detection and arrest, swift prosecution, and the realization that one must pay for his law violations."

Interest in parole practices has been sharpened by reports of abuses. Charges that political influence was brought to bear for release of Joseph (Socks) Lanza, labor racketeer, stirred up a political storm in New York which may result in an overhaul of that state's parole system. Gov. Averell Harriman named a committee of experts on July 9 to "review the structure, practices, and procedure" of the state parole board and to develop recommendations for "such administrative changes and legislation as they consider necessary and desirable to improve the parole program."

The furor started last February when Parole Board Commissioner James R. Stone ordered freeing of Lanza two weeks after he had been taken into custody for violation of parole; the racketeer had been released originally in 1950 after serving seven years of a maximum 15-year sentence for extortion. The Democratic governor and Republican legislature immediately ordered separate investigations of the case, Stone resigned under fire, and Lanza was

[5] An individual on parole is a former prisoner who is completing his sentence out of prison but under the supervision of a parole officer. An individual on probation is a convicted offender who has been allowed to go free under the supervision of a probation officer instead of serving a prison sentence. The same officers serve both parolees and probationers in many jurisdictions.

rearrested and sent to Sing Sing for the remainder of his term.

Testimony before the Joint Legislative Committee on Government Operations[6] last spring highlighted some of the popular objections to parole when granted to unregenerate offenders. The committee was told that Lanza on parole had engaged in some of the same activities which led to his original arrest. A parole officer contended that Lanza never should have been paroled because he had not been "rehabilitated," lacked any "feeling of guilt," and had been returned to "an environment too full of temptation."

Parole as Means of Easing Prison Overcrowding

Criticism of parole practices indicates that many unworthy prisoners are released too soon, but that many others are kept in jail when they would have good prospects of going straight if released. Support for more liberal use of the parole instrument is boosted by the serious overcrowding in many penal institutions.

State and federal prisons at the end of 1956 had an inmate population of 188,730—largest total ever recorded—against a normal capacity of about 175,000.[7] Many city and county jails are overflowing. The average daily prison population in Washington, D. C., for example, has more than doubled since 1946 and now stands at 4,600 in institutions intended to accommodate only 3,200 inmates. "Prisoners are cramped together, with double-decked beds, in some quarters no more than 18 inches apart, under very unwholesome conditions." [8]

Congestion makes it difficult to maintain order and morale within an institution; it is frequently a factor in prison riots; at best it tends to counteract the beneficial effects of a prison's rehabilitation program. Yet the taxpayer, faced by growing demands on the part of many other public facilities, is understandably reluctant to put out large sums to improve living conditions for prisoners. Former New Jersey Gov. Alfred E. Driscoll told a meeting of the National Institute on Crime and Delinquency last July 15

[6] Democrats denounced the legislative committee as "a political propaganda machine bent upon a program of pure muckracking," while Republicans described a special report on the Lanza case prepared for the governor by the Acting Investigation Commissioner as "a wordy whitewash."

[7] The state and federal prison population has increased by 23,000 since 1950, by 50,000 since 1946.

[8] Report of special District of Columbia Committee on Prisons, Probation and Parole, April 1957.

that "One of the tragedies of our time is the fact that it is easier to secure funds for almost every other service than the construction and adequate staffing of prisons and the maintenance of high-level, technically trained parole and probation services." To expand parole and probation services, moreover, would cost much less than to enlarge prison facilities.

James V. Bennett, director of the Federal Bureau of Prisons, said in an address at Los Angeles in August 1956 that nearly a billion dollars would have to be spent on state and federal prisons by 1975 unless other methods of relieving prison overcrowding were adopted. He told a conference of penal authorities that the high cost of prison construction made it advisable to "depend on brains rather than bars" to control crime in the future.

City jails are said to be needlessly packed with petty offenders. Bennett has suggested that Atlanta, Baltimore, Chicago, Philadelphia, St. Louis and other cities could settle disputes over location of new jails simply by paroling hundreds of harmless misdemeanants, including persons jailed for failing to comply with support orders, alcoholics, "skid row denizens and other outcasts." [9] A committee of experts appointed by the District of Columbia commissioners recently advised greater reliance on probation, rehabilitation, and parole as an alternative to construction of a new $10 million prison.

Even when prison accommodations are adequate, the economic advantages in early parole are obvious. To maintain a prisoner in Washington, D. C., costs $1,124 a year, whereas the annual outlay for supervising a parolee is only $142. In New York it costs $4,000 a year to keep a prisoner in a reformatory, $1,600 to hold him in jail, and $165 to supervise him on parole.[10]

Support of Parole as Effective Crime Deterrent

Proponents of parole are afraid that its pocketbook appeal increases the number of releases without providing the necessary facilities for carrying on an effective parole program. The most persuasive argument in favor of early, conditional release is that parole, when properly adminis-

[9] James V. Bennett, "Probation and Parole Among the States," *State Government*, June 1957, p. 130.

[10] Prison Association of New York, *Annual Report for 1956* (1957), p. 85.

tered, does more than long imprisonment to deter crime. Parole is almost universally accepted by authorities as a useful tool in the corrective process, but they feel the general public has not been made sufficiently aware of its merits.

Many persons still think of parole as a reduction of sentence, hence a favor granted to a prisoner. Parole is widely confused with time off for prison work or for good behavior and with commutation of sentence, which are actual reductions of sentence either earned by the prisoner or received as an act of mercy. But parole, properly administered, is none of these things. It does not excuse a prisoner from serving the remainder of his sentence; it provides only that the terminal part of the sentence be served in the community under supervision and surveillance. The purpose is to tide the prisoner over the difficult transition period from full incarceration to full freedom, and at the same time to protect the community against any tendency of the released prisoner to backslide.

Chief Justice Earl Warren told a national conference on parole last year that "It would be a very wholesome thing if out of this conference could come a public awareness of the fact that the parole of a prisoner is not an act of coddling but on the contrary . . . an extension of the state's supervision while he is trying to re-establish himself in society."

The National Probation and Parole Association favors a period of parole for every released prisoner, and a trend in that direction is shaping up. Federal law, and state laws in Kentucky and Wisconsin, make parole a condition of all early releases on good behavior. It is frequently pointed out that more than 95 per cent of all prisoners eventually return to the community. The contention follows that it is wiser—and safer—to let prisoners out early under supervision than to hold them to the end of their terms and then release them entirely from the jurisdiction of correctional authorities.

Trends in Operation of Parole Systems

PAROLE as a legally established procedure in the administration of criminal justice is of relatively recent origin. The British "ticket of leave" during the 18th century excused prisoners from further servitude if they took employment within a specified area and obeyed certain rules of good conduct. The "ticket of leave" was used extensively to colonize Australia.

Indenture of juvenile delinquents, released to the custody of private employers, was an early form of parole in the United States. The modern form was introduced in New York by the law which created Elmira Reformatory in 1869. An Ohio statute of 1884 authorized parole for inmates of state prisons. By 1900 parole systems of some kind were operating in 20 states. Ten years later the first federal parole act was approved. Today all states have parole laws of some type.

There are considerable differences among the states in legal provisions for parole, the extent to which parole is employed, and the facilities made available for operating parole programs. The proportion of state prisoners released on parole ranges from 99.2 per cent in Washington to only 7-8 per cent in Oklahoma and South Carolina. In ten states[11] four-fifths or more of all prisoners released are paroled, while in ten other states[12] and the District of Columbia not more than one-fourth of the prisoners are paroled.

The very newness of many existing parole programs accounts in part for the wide variations and for program inadequacies. When the first national conference on parole was called by the U.S. Attorney General in 1939, there were no universally recognized standards and procedures for administration of parole and only five states and the federal government had full-time parole boards. The first conference drew up a Declaration of the Principles of Parole, calling for "impartial, non-political, professionally competent parole systems." It was not until 1956, how-

[11] California, Connecticut, Indiana, Kansas, Minnesota, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Washington.

[12] Alabama, Delaware, Maryland, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Wyoming.

ever, that a second conference was assembled to bring leaders in the correctional field together for the express purpose of producing a manual on parole. The report on the conference, *Parole in Principle and Practice*, published in 1957 by the National Probation and Parole Association, now serves as a guide for legislative and administrative reforms.

The states are just beginning to move toward that uniformity of parole law and practice which is considered essential to effective utilization of parole as a deterrent to crime. It is only since 1951 that all 48 states have been party to the Interstate Compact for the Supervision of Parolees and Probationers, under which states agree to accept and supervise approved cases from other states. The compact is of service whenever it appears that a parolee can make a better fresh start in a state other than that in which he was convicted. Some 12,000 cases, the vast majority of them involving parolees, are handled annually under interstate agreements.

State and Federal Parole Boards and Officers

Recent parole legislation shows growing acceptance of N.P.P.A. recommendations that parole authority in each state be centralized and function independently of the penal establishments. At least 25 states, as well as the federal government, now have full-time parole boards.

Some states follow the older method of vesting parole authority in correctional officers, or in top-ranking state officers—the governor, the attorney general, the secretary of state or others—who function *ex officio* as a parole board. In Arkansas the penitentiary board is the parole authority. In Kansas and Maryland parole may be granted by either the governor or a board of prison authorities. Certain states assign parole authority to the state department of corrections. Others place it in the state welfare department. California and Minnesota have separate parole authorities for adults and for youthful offenders. Two women among five members of the Massachusetts parole board are entitled to pass only on female prisoners.

The federal structure is typical of the more advanced systems in the states. The U.S. Board of Parole consists of eight members (three serving for cases of youths aged 22 or less), appointed by the President with the consent

of the Senate for six-year terms. The board is responsible for "the exercise of all quasi-judicial functions with respect to the granting, denying, and revoking of parole, reparoling and re-releasing conditionally, the establishment of rules and regulations with reference to parole and parole supervision, the imposition or modification of the conditions of parole or conditional release, the issuance of warrants and orders of revocation, and the establishment of general parole policies." [13]

REGULATIONS ON PRISONER ELIGIBILITY FOR PAROLE

Parole authorities usually have considerable discretion in determining when a prisoner is ready for parole, but in most states the law requires that the prisoner serve a minimum period before becoming eligible for parole. Under the federal parole system an adult prisoner is not eligible until he has served one-third of his term, up to a maximum of 15 years of any sentence including life imprisonment.

About a dozen states follow the federal one-third rule, and some allow earlier parole for good behavior. Two states (Arkansas and Georgia) set no minimum period to precede parole, and seven others (Idaho, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, Oregon, Utah, West Virginia) prescribe no minimum with certain exceptions, chiefly prisoners serving life terms for murder. A Florida prisoner may be paroled after six months, or even earlier if his term is not more than 18 months. A Nevada prisoner must serve at least one year, less an allowance for good behavior.

The trend is toward more flexibility in establishing parole eligibility. Where the indeterminate sentence is used, the usual rule is to require that the prisoner serve his minimum term, possibly reduced by an allowance for good behavior, before being paroled. The parole board in Michigan, however, may apply to the court to have the minimum sentence reduced to permit earlier release under parole. A prisoner may be paroled in California after serving one-third of his minimum sentence, in Massachusetts after serving two-thirds.

More than half the states have erected statutory barriers against paroling certain classes of prisoners. At least ten states (Georgia, Kansas, Mississippi, Montana, Nevada,

[13] Scovel Richardson, "Policies and Procedures of the United States Board of Parole," *Federal Probation*, December 1955, p. 14.

YEARS IN PRISON REQUIRED OF LIFE-TERMERS BEFORE PAROLE

Jurisdiction	No. of years	Jurisdiction	No. of years	Jurisdiction	No. of years
U.S. federal	15	Maine	30	No. Carolina	10
		Maryland	15	Ohio	10*c*
California	7	Massachusetts	20	Oregon	7
Colorado	10	Michigan	10	Rhode Island	10
Connecticut	25*a*	Minnesota	25*ab*	So. Carolina	5*a*
Delaware	15	Mississippi	10	Texas	15
Dist. of Col.	15	Montana	25	Utah	15
Idaho	10	Nevada	7	Washington	20*a*
Illinois	20	New Jersey	25*a*	West Virginia	10*d*
Kentucky	8	New Mexico	10	Wisconsin	20*a*

*a*Minus time for good behavior. *b*35 years if previously convicted. *c*Except life-termers convicted of murder. *d*15 years if previously convicted.

New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, North Dakota, Oregon) deny parole to repeaters, some after the second, others after the third or fourth conviction. Oregon, Pennsylvania, and Virginia parole no life-termers. Other states refuse parole to prisoners who have committed offenses such as treason, first or second degree murder, and use of a dangerous weapon in an escape attempt. In most states, as under federal law, a life sentence is not a barrier to parole. The shortest period a lifer must serve before parole, in jurisdictions where a minimum is fixed by statute, ranges from five to 30 years.

METHODS OF SELECTION FOR PAROLE FROM PRISON

No prisoner has an inherent right to parole, only a right to be considered for parole under certain conditions. In many states, consideration for parole is automatic and does not require an application from the prisoner. Under the federal system a member of the parole board visits each of the 25 institutions for adult prisoners at least once each three months, so that every prisoner may be interviewed for parole during the quarter in which he becomes eligible. A printed transcript of the interview, the board member's analysis and recommendations, and a complete biographical file on the prisoner are submitted to the board, which acts by majority vote. If parole is denied, the case is reviewed on the anniversary of the prisoner's eligibility date.[14]

Rigid criteria for selection of parolees are rarely applied. The chairman of the U.S. Board of Parole states: "Parole

[14] When a parole is revoked, the case is automatically reconsidered a year later, or sooner if a member of the board so requests.

selection is a constant balancing of the positive against the negative factors in each case, in an effort to insure the release under supervision of only those inmates who it is felt will live and remain at liberty without violating the law, and whose release is not incompatible with the welfare of society." [15]

A workshop discussion of parolee selection at the national conference on parole last year emphasized two major factors commonly considered in deciding whether an eligible prisoner should be paroled: (1) indications of "the presence or absence of a predominant pattern of anti-social behavior," and (2) the kind of offense the prisoner committed. Experienced parole officers have learned that prisoners who have committed offenses against property are the poorest parole risks. Forgers, extortionists, confidence men, burglars "tend to have poorer parole records than those convicted of sex offenses, assault or homicide, excepting homicide committed in connection with robbery." [16]

Good behavior in prison does not necessarily foreshadow law-abiding conduct on the outside. A prisoner may be biding his time before resuming criminal pursuits, or he may have adapted himself so well to the institutional pattern of existence that he will be unable to adjust even to the relative independence of parole. Ideally, parole should be granted at the point when a prisoner is prepared for a law-abiding life outside and has lawful means of self-support. A few jurisdictions still require a parolee to have a job lined up.

Parole and the Reform of Offenders

THE THEORY originally underlying parole was that a truly repentant offender could be let out of prison safely under certain restrictive conditions. The ex-prisoner must agree to observe various rules designed to assure his good conduct and to assist in maintaining police surveillance over him. Any infraction of the conditions of parole would make the former convict liable to recommitment for the

[15] Scovel Richardson, "Policies and Procedures of the United States Board of Parole," *Federal Probation*, December 1955, p. 15.

[16] The National Conference on Parole, *Parole in Principle and Practice* (1957), p. 104.

balance of his term. The threat of re-imprisonment was regarded as a powerful inducement to go straight.

Later it was realized that the average parolee needed special protection at first from the moral pitfalls of society, because he was likely to experience unusual difficulty in finding a decent job and settling down to normal family life. It was found that transition from a completely authoritarian institutional existence to even partial freedom made extraordinary demands on a parolee's character. The first 100 days constituted a critical period for success or failure in the new life.

The concept of a parole officer as guardian, as well as guard, over the newly released prisoner has gained considerable ground in recent years. The professionalization of probation and parole, reflected in upgrading of qualifications for field officers, has been largely in terms of social work training. An authority has observed that "The emergence of probation and parole as an occupation identified with the field of social work is one of the significant developments of recent years." [17]

Rules Governing Conduct of Paroled Offenders

Although the social work point of view dominates the parole field today, the earlier concept of parole as a form of punitive restraint persists in the many rules laid down to govern the behavior of parolees. In general, these rules have changed little since the beginnings of parole. A recent survey of state parole policies listed 24 regulations pertaining explicitly to restrictions on parolee behavior. In some states the former prisoner must keep in mind more than 20 different stipulations on what he can or cannot do.

Forty-one states forbid any drinking of alcoholic beverages by parolees; four states (Florida, Idaho, Michigan, New Jersey) merely forbid drinking to excess. Association or correspondence with "persons of poor reputation" is forbidden in 38 states. Many of the states require that parolees get permission to change residence or employment (39 states), to get married (33 states), to own or operate an automobile (30 states), to incur a debt (11 states), to travel out of the state (34 states). Monthly reports must be filed by parolees in 38 states. They must

[17] Ben S. Meeker, "Probation and Parole Officers at Work," *NPPS Journal*, April 1957, p. 100.

abide by a curfew—10:30 or 11 P.M.—in six states. Kansas and Nebraska insist on regular church attendance.

Many parole officers feel that the rules laid down by law for parolee behavior are too detailed, too inflexible, and in some cases too repressive. It has been pointed out that the rules originated in a period when relatively little case work was done on parolees and when it was necessary to mollify popular antagonism toward parole. According to one critic:

> The fallacy . . . is that . . . [the rules method of surveillance] disregards the theory of individualization of justice, which is one of the underlying tenets of probation and parole. Such an approach prefabricates . . . a model citizen and places upon the parolee . . . the responsibility of transforming himself into the image . . . of that model.
>
> Today a sounder and more realistic approach is taken by progressive agencies . . . Within certain limits, the agent manipulates the leashes that bind the parolee in such fashion that excessive restraints may be removed when they are no longer necessary.[18]

Other experts consider the rules not only necessary for public protection but of help in rehabilitating offenders. Some newly released prisoners, accustomed to institutional regimentation, may need a prescribed code of conduct until they get their bearings. More important than the rules themselves are the manner and spirit in which the parole officer applies them. If he is objective, friendly yet firm, he may win over a resentful parolee's objections to rules.

Under most parole laws, officers are not required to report every violation of parole rules, and if they do, the parole authorities are not required to revoke parole for any and all violations. The parole officer has considerable leeway in using the rules for constructive purposes, or he may use them as threats. A Maryland court said recently: "A parolee is not expected or required at once to achieve perfection. If his conduct is that of the ordinary well-behaved person, with no more lapses than all people have, with no serious offenses charged against him and with no indication that he intends in the future to pursue the course which led to his original conviction, the courts and probation officers should not seek for unusual and irrelevant grounds upon which to deprive him of his freedom." [19]

---

[18] Edward J. Hendrick, "Conditions and Violations," *NPPA Journal*, January 1956, p. 3.

[19] Quoted by Sol Rubin, "Legal View of Probation and Parole Conditions," *NPPA Journal*, January 1956, p. 37.

REHABILITATION FAILURES FROM CASE OVERLOADING

The greatest obstacle to rehabilitation of criminals through parole services is the shortage of parole officers. While correctional authorities plead for paroling of more prisoners as an alternative to packing the prisons, the parole staffs in most communities are hard pressed to give even minimum service to the cases they already have.

It is a generally accepted rule that no parole or probation officer should handle more than 50 cases at one time—the actual number to vary according to the number of pre-parole investigations the officer has to make. The number would vary also according to the nature of the cases; some parolees need little overseeing, while others have involved personal problems requiring many sessions with the parole officer.[20]

Most probation and parole officers have to handle many more than 50 cases. "Gross understaffing in many of these departments has reduced the quality and quantity of their work to the point where the lack of supervision of probationers and parolees constitutes a menace to themselves and to society and makes a farce of probation and parole." [21]

Surveys by the National Probation and Parole Association indicate that the adult and juvenile probation and parole case load per officer averages 250 cases; in some instances the load for a single officer exceeds 1,000 cases. The association estimates that 40,000 supervisory officers are needed, in contrast to the 7,000 now on the job and without taking into consideration an anticipated increase of cases in the 10 to 17-year-old group. "The direct effect of large case loads is seen in a lowered quality of work, poor staff morale, and failure to provide protection to the public." J. Edgar Hoover told the national conference on parole: "Parole supervision . . . exists in name only in too many cases. . . . It is a marvel that parole succeeds as well as it does. . . . The time has come for public indignation over the failure to give these men and women a chance to do their jobs properly."

Heavy case loads result in part from inadequate budgets

---

[20] A parole officer has described some of his duties as follows: "The parole agent must check addresses, inspect home conditions, examine bank accounts, investigate information on misconduct, count empty liquor bottles."—Ervis W. Lester, "Parole Treatment and Surveillance—Which Should Dominate?" *National Probation and Parole Association Yearbook for 1952*, p. 35.

[21] Hugh P. Reed, "Caseloads," *NPPA Journal*, April 1957, p. 143.

for staffing of parole offices, in part from the difficulties of recruiting trained personnel. Prescribed qualifications for parole officers differ, but the trend is toward requiring a college degree, specialized education in social work, and either experience or graduate work in the correctional field. Parole officers for the most part are drawn from the limited supply of the nation's trained social workers. The Council on Social Work Education recently reported that it was conservative to estimate that the nation would need about 12,500 new social workers each year in the period immediately ahead. The whole student body (full-time, part-time and extension students) in the nation's 52 schools of social work now totals under 7,000.

Salaries paid probation and parole officers offer little inducement to recruitment. N.P.P.A. studies show that average salaries of field officers (excluding heads of divisions) range from $3,800 to $4,600, depending on size of the community. "Unless this picture changes drastically for the better, probation-parole work will, before too long, become the province of (1) those who are dedicated to this kind of career and . . . have income from other sources; (2) those striving to make it professionally and economically respected, meanwhile enduring the sacrifice . . . ; (3) those for whom it is just a temporary stopgap before acceptance of a higher paying position in another field; and (4) those who are completely unqualified for the work but prefer it to working at a menial job at about the same rate of pay." [22]

Pre-Parole Programs to Assist Rehabilitation

A number of correctional systems have recently introduced a new step, between imprisonment and parole, calculated to promote the success of the rehabilitative process. So-called pre-parole programs usually entail creation of another facility, often a camp, where prisoners about to be paroled may live in greater freedom, more in the normal pattern of family life than in prison. The pre-parole camp is gaining favor as a necessary cushion against the shock experienced by many long-term prisoners when they shift abruptly from a regimented to an open community existence.

One of the more advanced programs of this kind, carried out in a pre-parolee camp near Michigan's largest state prison, was established in 1953. The men in the camp live

[22] John Schapps, "Salaries Are Strategic," *NPPA Journal*, April 1957, p. 154.

in a homelike environment, sit four at a table for meals, and attend lectures that may be of practical value to them in the future. Topics include alcoholism, low-income budgeting, family relationships, community agencies, the police and the parolee, legal problems, employment hints, religion, and mental well-being. Inmates are encouraged to ask questions and freely discuss their problems.[23]

Similar pre-parole facilities have been set up in other jurisdictions. The Massachusetts legislature last year authorized establishment of a pre-parole camp. A branch of an Illinois penitentiary puts pre-parolees on trusty status and gives them outdoor work.

Need for Cooperation of Local Communities

Efforts are being made to break down community indifference to what goes on behind prison walls. Penal authorities realize that even the best correctional system cannot complete the job of rehabilitation unless the community is willing to accept the regenerated offender. Above all, it must be willing to give him a decent job.

Gov. Harriman of New York late last year announced establishment of a correctional employment service, which will not only help find jobs for parolees but also try to develop training programs in the prisons based on actual demands in the labor market. Inmates will be taught how to apply for a job, and industrial and labor representatives will be invited to interview them. The Prison Association of New York has recommended creation of a pre-parole facility near a large industrial hiring area to facilitate location of jobs for parolees.

A Ford Foundation grant of $600,000 to the National Probation and Parole Association is being used to support activities of special business and professional men's committees working with correctional authorities to improve rehabilitative programs for prisoners. Such committees are in action in eight states—Indiana, Michigan, Montana, Ohio, Oklahoma, Texas, Washington, West Virginia—and the N.P.P.A. announced on Sept. 23 that funds were being sought to launch similar programs in 20 additional states. The activities of the committees are said to have been responsible for growing use of probation and parole processes, improved preparation for parole, and widened job oppor-

[23] H. E. Kachelski, "An Approach to Parole Preparation," *Federal Probation*, June 1956, p. 29.

tunities for parolees in the areas in which the groups operate.

Whether increasing parole of prisoners will have the hoped-for effect of appreciably reducing crime remains to be seen. Statistics on parole violations offer no adequate means of judging the systems, because there is little uniformity in parole rules and methods. Supervision is so scanty in some areas that parole service is scarcely more than a keeping of records. Some parolees have no contact with a parole officer except to mail in a periodic report. Numerous authorities think that parole has still to be given a real chance to demonstrate its crime-reducing potential.